



**MEETING MINUTES**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD (HAB, Board)**

**Full Board Meeting**

*June 9 and 10, 2021*

*Virtual Meeting via Microsoft Teams*

**Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Opening.....	2
Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agency Updates .....	2
Introduction of HAB Work Plan and Calendar for Fiscal Year 2022 .....	8
Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste Project .....	10
Draft Advice – Public Involvement in Vision and Guiding Documents .....	12
Congratulatory Letter on Tank Integrity and Pipeline Integrity .....	14
Committee Reports .....	15
Round Robin Discussion .....	16
Board Business .....	21
Attachments .....	21
Attendees .....	21

*This is only a summary of issues and actions discussed at this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of represented ideas or opinions, and it should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.*

## **Opening**

Stan Branch, US Department of Energy (DOE), announced that this meeting was being held in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Steve Wiegman, Public at Large and HAB Chair, welcomed meeting participants and provided a short overview of meeting etiquette. He announced that there would be several Board members rotating off the board either resulting from end of service term or through resignation.

Larry Lockrem, Benton County, announced his resignation. He thanked the Board and DOE for his 15 years of service, and provided thanks to Susan Leckband, Washington League of Woman Voters, for her mentorship during his time with the Tank Waste Committee (TWC). He appreciated the opportunity to serve and hoped to allow the younger generation of Board members to participate in his absence.

Steve thanked the other members that would be rotating off, which included:

- Gary Busselman, Public-at-Large
- Angela Day, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington
- Paige Knight, Hanford Watch
- Gregory Korshin, University of Washington
- Mohamed Osman, Washington State University Tri-Cities
- Dan Serres, Columbia Riverkeeper

Ginger Wireman, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), noted her concern with the process of appointing new members. Several members were rotating off the Board while new member appointment packages were not completed and approved in time for their departure. She was concerned that HAB business would need to continue without the full complement of members.

Steve acknowledged the challenge of prospective members wishing to participate but being unable outside of public comment periods. He recognized that one such prospective member, Esteban Ortiz, GreenLatinos, hoped to speak, and Steve allowed it. Esteban stated that he was looking forward to bringing a diverse perspective and learning how to best contribute to the Board.

## **Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agency Updates**

### *US Department of Energy (DOE)*

Brian Vance, DOE, provided an update on the state of operations and projects across the Hanford Site. He explained that health and safety continued to be the highest priority for projects across the site. Though the COVID-19 pandemic impacted every project on the site, tremendous progress was made.

He introduced Brian Stickney, DOE, who would assist in the question-and-answer session for this meeting. Brian Stickney was appointed to the role of Deputy Manager in May and brought extensive experience to the role; Brian Vance expected great things from him.

DOE was focused in five main areas as site owner:

- Health and safety
- Transition to operations and operational culture
- Project delivery excellence
- Commitment to constructive engagement with stakeholders
- Teamwork between the department, contractors, and community

Brian Vance described pandemic management efforts since the previous Board meeting in March. He recognized that COVID-19-related conditions within the community have improved, but they were still watching for a potential resurgence. The site was effectively fully mobilized with a 60/40 split between on-site and remote workers. The previous day, the site announced and began to implement new guidelines for fully vaccinated personnel. He noted that heat was another considerable health and safety concern.

An on-site team continued to provide vaccinations for Hanford Site personnel, having issued approximately 2,000 doses of the vaccine to date. On May 24<sup>th</sup>, Hanford Mission Integration Solutions (HMIS) issued a video called “Why I Got Vaccinated” in which employees shared why they chose to be vaccinated. DOE supported the mission of getting COVID-19 under control and was working to communicate the mission to the broader workforce.

Site leaders continued to examine job sequencing to ensure social distancing was maintained. The Volpentest HAMMER Federal Training Center had done well in training for social distancing and set a strong example through creative use of space for classrooms. Virtual meetings were being utilized to continue dialogue between all parties.

Regarding the Direct-Feel Low Activity Waste (DFLAW) Project, Brian Vance noted that strong performance had been observed across all related projects, and integration efforts were continuing site-wide. A working group meeting was held to examine the needs for transition to operations. The group identified 30 to 40 items that needed to create a site-wide synergy dynamic, which were in the process of implementation.

He reviewed individual projects. The manipulator arm commissioning was underway; the plant was finished and staging was underway. The Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF) was largely complete. Infrastructure work to support DFLAW was moving forward, which also served as a reliability effort for the site going forward. Tank Side Cesium Removal (TSCR) operational testing was complete.

A key element in the success of the projects was teamwork and a collective commitment to support DFLAW. They continued to engage with other sites within the DOE complex for lessons learned and worked to identify gaps early to ensure that operations could commence on time.

DOE continued to focus on safe and cost-effective risk reduction efforts. Brian Vance recently toured the site and observed that the teams did well in capturing issues of the past and applying lessons learned from previous contamination challenges for the 324 Building project. The 324 Building team was working in Room 18 for interference removal. The team did well in looking ahead and utilized the mockup facility well.

The team had done well in installing infrastructure for AX-103 throughout the pandemic. The last facility adjacent to the K-East reactor was set to be demolished, and the Central Plateau remediation contractor was in the process of rubble removal. The facility demolition would allow an interim safe storage superstructure shell to be constructed around the reactor. Paving for the Capsule Storage Area was complete, and equipment to transport the capsules was expected to arrive later that calendar year. The Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) continued to make progress; containerization of Plutonium Reclamation Facility (PFR) rubble was approximately 55% complete.

Regarding other risk reduction efforts, Brian Vance noted that cybersecurity continued to be a concern and focus. He regularly toured and listed to concerns site-wide, and the Department took the safety concerns of site workers and community very seriously.

Brian Vance provided an overview of the B-109 tank leak, starting with a short history of the tank. B-109 was a 530,000-gallon tank that received contaminated liquids between 1946 and 1976. It was deemed sound while in service. It held an estimated 15,000 gallons of liquid waste as part of its total waste volume of approximately 123,000 gallons, which primarily consisted of solid sludge and salt cake. It was previously dewatered to mitigate leak risk.

The B Farm was about eight miles from the Columbia River and approximately 200 feet above groundwater. There was no retrieval infrastructure in the B Farm at the time. The Tank and Pipeline Integrity (TAPI) program leak assessment process concluded that the tank was likely leaking, at which time DOE made notifications. It was estimated that leaking contents would take at least 25 years to reach groundwater. In previous assessments, it was estimated that the B Farms overall had leaked approximately 350,000 gallons of contaminated material into the area. There were extraction wells installed in the surrounding areas, which extracted approximately 6,000,000 gallons of groundwater per month.

Given the rate of the leak, extraction capacity, and heavy contamination already in the area, DOE determined that the tank leak was a minor contribution from an overall risk portfolio of the site; it did not present additional risk to site workers or additional risk to the public at that time. DOE had risk mitigations in place and was actively discussing the situation with Ecology and the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Brian Vance personally called elected officials and Tribal leaders when announcing the leak.

Public outreach efforts were continuing. They strived to maintain robust community engagement. They briefed local mayors, Tribal leaders, and Congressional staff as appropriate, regularly and as requested. DOE continued to support boards and community events. He noted that Hanford Live was one such event that saw success. DOE appreciated the support received from Senators Murray and Cantwell and Congressman Newhouse, as well as their continued engagement.

Teamwork enhancements were underway between site contractors and subcontractors with the hope of moving toward a “One Hanford” goal. Brian Vance was optimistic about what could be accomplished in the coming years.

#### *Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)*

David Bowen, Ecology, introduced himself and thanked the HAB members for their service.

Ecology was undergoing an organizational restructuring resulting from an organizational assessment conducted in 2020. The assessment examined workload, leadership capabilities, and other factors. Ecology formed a staff advisory group that represented a cross section of the workforce to provide recommendations to the management team based on the findings of the assessment.

Ecology is working towards distributing its work more equitably within the agency, which included shifting staff between the Tank Waste Treatment and DFLAW programs. It was noted that there were many personnel on staff that were or would soon be eligible for retirement. As a result, they were recruiting heavily in hopes of training and passing institutional knowledge on to new personnel.

COVID-19 and organizational structure changes had affected hiring; Ecology had a 17% position vacancy rate. They were also working to fill “acting” positions with permanent positions. Nina Menard, Ecology, was appointed as Section Manager.

Regarding B-109, the TPA dictated the actions Ecology needed to follow when a Single Shell Tank (SST) leak was detected. DOE conducted the formal leak assessment and provided a notification to Ecology.

Ecology and DOE were actively discussing how to respond to the tank leak, examining the risks of potential actions. Should a unanimous agreement not be reached, Ecology had the ability to initiate an enforcement action directly under its Hazardous Waste Management Act (HWMA) authority.

Ecology's proposed holistic negotiations for tank waste retrieval and treatment were underway. They were meeting weekly and David was cautiously optimistic regarding the outcome, as common ground between the Ecology and DOE was found. They were working with a mediator, finding timelines and processes that worked for everyone without missing milestones. Ecology had direction to continue the negotiation talks through June, at least.

Compliance activities were being done despite the challenges the COVID-19 pandemic posed. Compliance inspections were being conducted and reports were being issued. Ecology was ahead of its target for inspections defined in its 5-year goals. There was considerable activity related to permitting, primarily associated with getting the Waste Treatment Plant up and running.

#### *US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)*

Dave Einan, EPA, thanked the HAB and provided a brief update. He noted that EPA brought on additional staff, but it was not as much as it hoped to. He also stated that there were Records of Decision and Explanations of Significant Differences representing projects over the \$50,000,000 threshold that were expected to be signed by the end of the fiscal year.

#### *Board Member Questions*

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest, thanked the agency representatives for the briefings. He asked if there would be a return to in-person Board meetings in line with DOE's budget planning workshop in July. Brian Vance stated that it was unlikely that in-person meetings would be allowed in the foreseeable future. David Bowen contributed, stating that Ecology was following direction from the Governor's Office and Washington State Department of Labor and Industries, which indicated that face-to-face interactions could be allowed in the fall, but nothing was certain at that time.

Gerry noted that there had been discussion around an opportunity with the B-109 to put the Test Bed Initiative (TBI) to use or alternate methods of safe offsite treatment and disposal to be tested. The budget requested \$7,000,000, which appeared to only be associated with TBI equipment. He wanted to know about the status of requesting funds for TBI utilization. Brian Vance explained that the TBI was intended for the West Farms and was not conducive to the contents of B-109 as the supernate was not easily accessible. He noted that the \$7,000,000 in question was associated with cost increases seen across the site, related to materials and commodities, and more specifically for removal of equipment when the test was completed. DOE would look for an opportunity that year to start moving the project forward again.

Steve Wiegman expressed the Board's appreciation for the briefings, and by extension, thanked the tens of thousands of people dedicating their time, energy, and intelligence to the Hanford cleanup effort. He invited the agencies to provide any ideas or comments on how the Board could help in the next year.

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge, hoped to hear about the vision for TBI and public involvement from DOE or Ecology. Additionally, she had been hearing good things about the core sampling program and wondered if there was additional comment to be provided related to it. Brian Vance noted that the TBI would go through the permitting process, and within that process there would be a public comment period. Regarding the core sampling, it was a standard procedure that was proven effective that would continue.

Chris Sutton, Public at Large, noted that the President's budget for fiscal year 2022 identified eight overarching goals for DOE, none of which involved environmental cleanup. He wondered if that would impact the ability to secure funding for the site and if it would be a detriment to timelines for Hanford cleanup. Brian Vance stated that the President's budget demonstrated commitment to cleanup on the Hanford Site and that they could accomplish a lot with the funding available. He did not see a change in commitment to cleanup and felt it was unlikely that they would see a change in support given over time based on the successes achieved and value provided.

Pam Larsen, City of Richland, commented that she read an interview in the Weapons Complex Monitor featuring David Bowen and found it very encouraging. She looked forward to his work and thought he would prove to be a strong leader.

Regarding previous comments on in-person meetings, Ginger Wireman noted that Benton and Franklin Counties were behind the curve on COVID-19 vaccine distribution, which could pose a risk if hosting a meeting in the region.

Susan Leckband thanked DOE and the regulators for their presentations, noting that the information shared allowed the HAB to be more informed. She also noted that the goal in the near future should be to have in-person meetings as soon as possible and logical. She believed it was time to start planning for that eventuality, potentially with hybrid remote elements for those with safety or health concerns. She understood Ginger's caution and recognized that it was very concerning for some people, but planning could begin.

Emmitt Jackson, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees, asked David how Ecology was accounting for diversity in its recruiting efforts. David stated they held weekly to monthly discussions on this topic. They were assessing their position descriptions to find and correct unknowing bias and examining their legacy systems, which were designed in the 1970s and in a different area, in order to ensure that they would not discourage potential applicants. They were also working to ensure that their interview panels were diverse. He believed that a science-based approach would attract a diverse population.

Tom Galioto, Public at Large, wondered if DOE would be able to provide a presentation for the Fiscal Year 2023 budget ahead of the public meeting on the subject. Brian stated that he was not aware of the request but was certain that the appropriate staff would be working through the request. He would address it when it was ready.

Antone Brooks, Benton-Franklin Public Health, asked about efforts to remove cesium from tank waste, noting that it was the highest hazard both biologically and due to its mobility. He wondered if it would be able to be removed from large tanks or if it was just a pilot project. Brian Vance noted that TBI was a pilot project, while TCSR was a proven process for cesium removal that was already in-place for use in the AP Farm tanks. The TCSR process could be performed in large scale and would be part of the process for preparing feed for the Waste Treatment Plant. The system was installed and would be ready later that calendar year.

Shelley Cimon, Columbia RiverKeeper, appreciated the presentations provided. She also noted appreciation for Ginger's earlier comment, reiterating the concern Board openings and the difficulties in getting new membership packets approved through DOE headquarters. She wanted to be proactive on resolving the issue and requested any ideas that Brian Vance might have on potential opportunities for collaboration in that regard. She noted that the Savannah River board was initially a 25-member board, which had been reduced to seven people due to membership packet delays. Shelley hoped to hold an Executive Issues Committee (EIC) meeting in the coming weeks to discuss those issues.

Shelley noted that Mark Gilbertson, the Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Regulatory and Policy Affairs in the DOE Office of Environmental Management (EM), spoke at a recent Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) chairs meeting, where he relayed that DOE's current focus was on climate action planning and energy adaptation and resiliency regarding climate change. Shelley hoped that a headquarters representative would be able to provide a presentation to the HAB.

Laurene Contreras, Yakama Nation, noted she heard concerns regarding the process for implementation of orders from Secretary Granholm of the DOE. For the Yakama Nation, the Hanford Site footprint contained precious and sacred areas that it wanted protected, noting that it consisted of ceded Yakama Nation territory. She wanted to see the natural resources protected. She was glad that Yakama Nation concerns were heard and hoped everyone would remember the sacredness of the area during their operations. She had heard from elected leaders that they would never achieve full cleanup, but she wanted to push for it as best possible out of concern for citizens local to the area, the environment, and waters. Regarding the COVID-19 restrictions, she was happy to see things opening and hoped to get back to in-person meetings. She looked forward to meeting everyone. Additionally, she noted that her staff were participating in Yakama Nation Treaty Day observances and hoped that the day would gain wider observance in the future.

Liz asked for an update on the process of HAB member packet approvals. Brian Vance stated that leadership was briefed in advance of submission and expected that to hold an upcoming brief on the subject with Ike White, DOE. He noted that the new administration would have new priorities, which could make the process take longer. They would continue to follow the process to ensure all related information is provided.

Emmitt requested clarification on an earlier request: Steve Wiegman asked a question about what the HAB could do for the TPA agencies in the coming year. Brian Vance clarified that he saw the HAB's engagement with its represented constituents and sharing of their perspectives to be of continued importance. He felt that was of considerable importance in the current remote work environment where face-to-face communication was not an option. He wanted the HAB to continue to focus on elements of work plan as well as examining the longer-term outlook. DOE was hoping for feedback within the five-year window, where policy-based and constructive advice could be given with enough time to act upon the given advice.

David Bowen agreed. Transparency and communication were the most valuable to Ecology. Where the Board had thoughts or ideas, he was willing to engage with the HAB. Ginger contributed, noting that the Board members could follow Ecology and DOE online through Facebook to help in expanding public outreach. Ecology, in particular, shared job announcements and asked that Board members share those with affiliated schools, alumni associations, or professional organizations.

Shelley asked if there was concern with ability of DFLAW program to access everything it needs from the international market, such as metals and supplies required to start or continue operations, given the supply chain challenges of the present international market. Brian Vance did not expect any such issues as construction was complete and a spare parts program was in place. The program had a sufficient stockpile of parts to outlast the present market conditions. However, as the programs were continually analyzed, he saw potential for change in how the program would consider the spare parts program in the future.

Steve Wiegman provided closing remarks. He noted that, going forward, he expected that the Board would discuss waste accumulation issues more frequently. The Hanford Site was not the ideal place for waste to stay, and he did not want to see it become a repository. He strongly believed that the issue should be part of conversations going forward.

### *Public Comment*

A member of the public asked about an inconsistency related to the listed leak status of Tank T-109. Though monthly reports listed the tank as structurally sound, the PHOENIX website listed it as a presumed leaker. Gary confirmed the tank to be structurally sound, rather than a presumed leaker.

### **Introduction of HAB Work Plan and Calendar for Fiscal Year 2022**

Gary Younger, DOE, presented the draft HAB work plan and calendar for Fiscal Year 2022. He thanked the EIC, Ecology, and EPA for their contributions in development of the work plan and calendar. He noted that it was developed with the intention of balancing the HAB's needs against the ability of the TPA agencies to support it, taking in consideration TPA agency staff support restrictions. The new work plan and calendar reflected the limited available support from DOE.

As a result of those considerations, DOE was working to maximize what the committees could do without oversight. They were working toward a plan where committees could hold calls or meetings at will without a public component, where presentations were not required. The option was a result of previously expressed HAB concerns.

Gary noted changes in format from previous years, which took into consideration features from other advisory boards within the complex. As it was a public document, background, descriptions of board committees, and topics and concerns of committees were detailed.

Quarterly Board meetings were presented on the calendar, along with a leadership workshop and a one-day meeting in October to serve as an orientation for new members. Committee meetings were arranged into "committee weeks" and could be adjusted as needed, accounting for the potential of emerging issues. Committee call placeholders were also set. There were two months where there was no HAB activity: January and July. These were blocked out due to staff shortages and for protection of existing staff, allowing staff time off during common holiday and vacation times.

On the topic of the work plan, it was noted that it was not an exhaustive list of what the HAB wanted to cover, but it was focused and in alignment with the Hanford Site five-year plan. Another change in format was the addition of a column for the outcome or action resulting from any given topic, noting that not every topic would require a presentation. Gary explained that it took approximately 100 manhours to build presentations; he hoped to bring in subject matter experts (SMEs) that could discuss topics without presentations.

### *Regulatory Perspectives*

Ecology and EPA representatives had nothing to add to the presentation of the draft HAB work plan.

### *Board Discussion*

Susan Leckband thanked Gary for the presentation. She expressed that she wished the Executive Issues Committee (EIC) and other Board members had been more involved in development of the draft work plan and calendar. Though she understood the concerns related to DOE staff support limitations, she felt that the calendar was inadequate. She felt that they would do well with the work plan but wondered if the outcomes would end up differing from what was expected. She wondered where the EIC planning calls for the HAB meetings were on the calendar, which would be required for agenda development. She asked for clarification regarding the at-will committee meetings. She was also disappointed that the October meeting was planned as a virtual meeting, despite being four months away. She felt it was essential to have an in-person meeting when introducing the new group.



Gary noted that the EIC meetings were not planned yet and recognized the need for them. He confirmed that Issue Manager (IM) teams and committees could hold calls at-will and without facilitation, with the caveat that they are not public. He preferred, however, that these meetings were limited to IM teams. He did not know if or when in-person meeting would be an option and planned based on current restrictions. Carrie Meyer, DOE, clarified that in-person meeting restrictions were related to COVID-19 protocols. They were working to implement current Centers for Disease (CDC) guidance for fully vaccinated individuals. This did not guarantee that in-person meetings would or would not happen, but they were working toward that option.

Ginger Wireman wondered if it would be worth reserving a meeting space to account for the possibility of in-person meetings being allowed by October. Carrie stated that she would be okay with reserving a space so long as there was no cancellation fee. She noted that the space would need to accommodate social distancing requirements and public participation.

Bob Suyama, Benton County, echoed Susan Leckband's concern with the reduced number of meetings. In the past, the HAB held more full Board and committee meetings. As the TWC committee chair, he had a first-hand understanding of the amount of work required to get advice from concept to completion. It took several meetings to make decisions regarding advice, taking it from the committee to the IM team, back to committee, and finally to the full Board. When there are fewer meetings for either the committee or the Board, it makes the process very time consuming. He was concerned that timely advice would not be able to be delivered as a result. Regarding the contents of the work plan, Bob noted that the TWC strived to ensure that it consisted of general categories that captured everything going on with tank waste.

Tom Galioto requested that a meeting to conduct an advanced discussion prior to the public meeting on the planned FY2024 Hanford budget submittal to DOE headquarters. He noted that he would need further guidance regarding unfacilitated meetings; he wanted to see a succinct description of how it was done and the format to be used. He requested the facilitation team provide something in that regard. Emmitt Jackson provided clarification on an additional topic he hoped to see on the work plan regarding site contractor transition and training processes.

Committee chairs for the River and Plateau Committee (RAP), Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP), and Public Involvement and Communication Committee (PIC) provided short overviews of their committee work plan contents with no further additions or requests.

Steve Wiegman noted that he was impressed by the list of topics the committees planned to deal with. He asked that Board members consider the HAB processes as they go forward and make necessary changes to how business is conducted in order to get work products finished and approved. He was encouraged by the depth of knowledge that board members had and was certain that they would figure out how to best utilize the unfacilitated meeting option.

Ruth Nicholson, HAB facilitator, noted that the current HAB Library location featured modestly sized meeting spaces that were available and suitable for hybrid in-person and remote meetings.

Shelley Cimon expressed her concern over required lead times for presentations, stating that she felt like writing a letter to her Congressional representative on the subject. She formally requested an EIC meeting for the following week. Gary agreed to investigate scheduling possibilities for an upcoming EIC meeting and provided further background on the process for developing and approving presentations.

Gary proposed the idea of getting the draft work plan and calendar approved during this Board meeting rather than the following one in September, if not formally than in principle, to allow committees to

proceed with confidence regarding their work plan topics. Several Board members expressed concern about deviating from the standard HAB practices per the HAB Process Manual.

On the second day of the meeting, consensus was not achieved for early adoption of the work plan. The draft work plan and calendar were expected to be formally adopted at the following Board meeting in September.

### **Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste Project**

Tom Fletcher, DOE, provided a DFLAW program update presentation. He started with a safety message related to management engagement and time in field, discussing the importance of maintaining operational awareness among management in order to listen and act upon real-time operational information and monitor critical performance elements.

The primary purpose of the presentation was to provide an update on the scope of the DFLAW Program as integrated systems and components transition through startup and preparation for operations. He displayed a graphic depicting all the components of the DFLAW program, demonstrating the function and interconnectivity between each. He described the process waste would undergo, from origination through disposal.

The construction of the Waste Treatment Plant was nearly done, with all paving and parking, fencing, and similar items completed. The Low Activity Waste (LAW) facility was in startup testing phases with completion expected that summer. Significant progress was made on the Effluent Management Facility (EMF), including validation of methodologies and hiring of laboratory technicians. Handover of the facility was completed and startup went well.

Significant progress was seen in the Tank Farms, including installation of TSCR ion exchange columns (ICX) restraints and pad, TSCR IXCs and filters installed and prepared for operational acceptance testing, and TSCR feed pump and transfer line installation, in addition to other projects. Several reliability projects that support the DFLAW program overall were completed, and significant progress was made on IDF-related projects. DOE was working effectively with EPA and Ecology to ensure permitting was on track.

Tom displayed a graphic that demonstrated the phase-gate process, which would serve to measure readiness in transitioning to a “One Hanford” 24/7 operational culture.

In closing, he stated that DFLAW projects advancing as planned with visible progress and positive momentum. Waste Treatment Plant dangerous waste and air permitting was on track.

### ***Regulatory Perspective***

Dan McDonald, Ecology, noted that the phase gate process could be thought of as a highway map that needed to be proactively managed to ensure that it stays on track and ensure they maintained sight of vulnerabilities. Knowing where potential schedule float could be a problem allowed them to proactively work to correct it. Regarding permitting, Dan noted that, though permitting was on track, it was a complex operation. Their goal was to see minimal float in permitting, which required the most well-managed processes that could be put in place by contractors, DOE, and Ecology. He looked forward to continuing relationships and good projects, processes, and ways of moving toward operational startup.

### *Board Discussion*

Tom Galioto asked for clarification regarding the intended start date for DFLAW hot operations, recalling a series of court-ordered delays related to COVID-19. Tom Fletcher stated that they were anticipating a start date in March of 2023, which could slip. Though the goal was to begin in 2023, they were allowed to go past that from a regulatory standpoint. Regarding TSCR-generated waste, Tom wanted to know how many columns were expected to be generated. Tom Fletcher did not have the answer immediately available and agreed to follow up on the question.

Susan Leckband asked, in Tom Fletcher's opinion, what the greatest schedule risk was. Tom Fletcher responded by saying that operational culture was the biggest wildcard, as it could not be managed as directly as construction or processes. They needed to make sure the culture and collective mindsets were in the right place before they could determine that they were truly ready for operations. They needed to ensure that they would know what to do when something went wrong. More specifically, they needed to ensure that the training was right and work control was right; these aspects are all human-initiated, and the people need to be comfortable with every aspect of the work.

Chris Sutton asked if there were specific concerns related to mechanical or operational aspects of DFLAW that the HAB could potentially advise on. Tom Fletcher stated there were no specific concerns at the time and that they expected to learn a lot more about the system when starting it up with water runs. They expected to update their processes and procedures based on the results of those runs. There could be aspects of the system that differ from expectations or design to discover. They would need to ensure that they were entirely ready to maintain operations in all aspects, because if the system needed to be shut down during a hot run, a melter would be lost permanently.

Chris also asked what preparations were being made regarding the operational readiness review (ORR). Tom Fletcher explained that the ORR was already underway, working to validate any system that was not previously approved. They recently kicked off the Integrated Safety Management System and contractor readiness assessments.

Shelley Cimon posed questions, the first related to the risk associated with each component of the overall system; she wondered what the flexibility of each component was. Tom Fletcher explained that the team worked across the board to find potential issues ahead of time to resolve them ahead of system startup. As an example, TSCR was set up a full year ahead of need. Shelley also asked about the potential value of having on-site fabrication capabilities for emergent needs. Tom Fletcher noted that that was among the topics undergoing discussion by the DFLAW leadership team.

Dan Solitz, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board, wondered when the hot commissioning would occur. Tom Fletcher explained that waste would start being run through TSCR in the first quarter of Fiscal Year 2022. Dan then asked about the organizational structure. Tom Fletcher reiterated that that concern was related to culture; they needed to ensure that all agencies and contractors working on-site and supporting the site were maintaining strong communications between organizations. As an example, if the mission support contractor was having an outage, would everyone else know about that? These individual elements in place are being tracked and looked at holistically to ensure risks are communicated and to ensure that individual events do not impact other projects.

Gerry Pollet requested a simple explanation regarding how much waste from DFLAW would be returned to double-shell tanks. Tom Fletcher confirmed that no waste would be returned to tanks under normal conditions. The only potential for return would be from EMF, if operating in off-normal conditions.

Pam Larsen recalled the discussion of integration between agencies and contractors supporting the Hanford Site and noted concern with the upcoming Tank Operations Contract transition, proving the example of unresolved gaps and loss of personnel when transitioning the Central Plateau Cleanup Contract. Tom Fletcher explained that there was enough time between contract transition and hot commissioning for the new contractor to establish itself in the new role and ensure that it is prepared for operations. Should it be necessary, hot commissioning could be extended as there is no required timeframe for it. This was done at the Savannah River Site in relation to the Salt Waste Processing Facility commissioning, so a precedent exists.

Steve Wiegman appreciated that the DLFLAW team would be willing to extend hot commissioning. He wondered if there was a process in place should the DFLAW need to shut down. Tom Fletcher explained that there was idle mode to allow for maintenance, a process which result in a stop in feeding to allow system component changeout. A complete shutdown, however, would result in glass solidifying within a melter and would require disposal of the entire melter. During idle and maintenance modes, the melter stays full and hot. Steve requested a future briefing on the off-gas system, wanting to know how it was collected and managed. Tom Fletcher explained that the EMF facility handles the off-gas stream; the EMF stream was the off-gas stream.

Emmitt Jackson expressed workforce-related concerns, wondering what tools were in place to coordinate the culture shift and entrance of new personnel into the workforce. Tom Fletcher explained that that was a work in progress. The DFLAW leadership council was looking into it. They wanted to ensure that contractors coordinate hiring such that they were not just hiring for their individual companies, but in the best interest of the site as a whole.

Liz Mattson wondered if aging equipment could be an issue for the LAW facility. Tom Fletcher stated that no problems were anticipated. The components could be retested to ensure that they meet the Washington Administrative Code (WAC), if required.

Rob Davis, City of Pasco, reiterated Pam's concern about changing contractors during startup and commissioning, considering the discussion about holistic integration and big picture concerns. Tom Fletcher explained that there were federal rules of acquisition that required the contract transitions, and it was already well past the date where transition was required. The team was doing everything possible to mitigate contract transition impacts.

Chris asked about cybersecurity measures. Tom Stated that the overall system was within the overall Hanford security system structure, while the control systems were fully isolated from the Hanford Intranet.

### **Draft Advice – Public Involvement in Vision and Guiding Documents**

Jeff Burright, Oregon Department of Energy and PIC chair, presented the draft advice, explaining the background, purpose for its development, and changes over time. The advice primarily resulted from concerns about public involvement with two recent documents: The DOE EM 10-Year Strategic Vision and Central Plateau Principles and Parameters.

## *Detailed Background*

### **US Department of Energy Environmental Management (DOE-EM) 10-Year Strategic Vision (Strategic Vision)**

The DOE Environmental Management office developed its second iteration of a Ten-Year Strategic Vision in late 2020. According to the EM website, “A strategic roadmap is needed to lay out how all the pieces of cleanup fit together to meet our ultimate and shared goal – completing the EM mission safely, effectively, and at a good value for the American taxpayer.” One stated purpose of the Strategic Vision is to support and inform the Administration’s budget proposal for DOE-EM.

The “Benefits” section of the Strategic Vision webpage states, “The Strategic Vision provides greater transparency enhancing EM’s credibility and accountability to regulators, tribal nations and local communities. EM’s cleanup plans and successes help us sustain and grow the community support we need.”

On October 20, 2020, DOE sent the draft Strategic Vision for the Hanford site to only the primary HAB seat-holders, with an eight-day deadline for comment. Only a few Board members were able to respond. The short response time and limited distribution made it impossible to put this in front of the Board for deliberation. The Board believes that for this and other vision documents, a longer and more inclusive public involvement process is necessary to achieve DOE’s stated goal of sustaining and growing community support.

The DOE Proposed Ten Year Strategic Vision would benefit from incorporating strategies for responding to major policy challenges or unforeseen circumstances, e.g., budget and funding opportunities or reductions; major accidents, new research or findings. The Board believes that DOE should bring the annual revision of the Ten-Year Vision out for annual public review and comment, and formal consultation with Tribes.

### **Central Plateau Principles and Parameters**

On October 28, 2020, a new document was formally adopted by the TPA agencies and added to a TPA Action Plan appendix. This document, titled, “Central Plateau Principles and Parameters,” (Principles document) codifies key parameters, principles, and cleanup criteria that were agreed upon by the TPA agencies and which are intended to create a set of regulatory blueprints that can be incorporated into every cleanup plan for the Central Plateau Inner Area.

The Board remembers and appreciates that in 2014-2015, the agencies brought to the Board draft concepts called the “Inner Area Principles”, for which the Board developed Advice 283 in 2015. However, the Board was surprised to see the formal adoption of this document into the TPA despite not having received any updates on the “Inner Area Principles” for the past five years. Over the past year and a half, the Board has specifically inquired about the status of the “Inner Area Principles” as a key part of a planned Committee of the Whole (COTW) topic focused on risk and Hanford cleanup end states.

The Board sees the lack of a public outreach effort accompanying the adoption of the TPA’s Principles document as a missed opportunity for the agencies to engage the public on the end-states of Hanford cleanup for the Central Plateau, an accessible and important topic that has wide ranging implications for the final footprint of the Hanford site. The Board believes that the TPA

agencies should have made the proposed draft of the Principles document available for public review and comment prior to formally adopting the document.

The Board understands that the Principles document constitutes a Class II change to the TPA, for which, “public review/comment may be required.” The Board recognized that public involvement in Class II changes are at the discretion of the agencies depending on situational factors but advises that when the agencies are faced with discretionary public involvement, the agencies choose more public involvement, not less.

The agencies have asserted that public involvement in this document was not necessary because formal public comment will be possible in the various separate decision documents that incorporate language from the Principles document in the future. However, when the Central Area Cleanup Principles are applied in developing plans, the Board is concerned that any public comments raising concerns or objecting to a particular plan will likely be responded to by noting that this was developed consistent with the Principles and merely implements the adopted Principles.

#### *Board Discussion*

Board members were in general agreement about the advice moving forward, with comments stating that it was a strong lead into other current issues the Board and SSAB chairs were considering, that was in line with Board tenants and principles, that it was forward looking, and that it was well written. Following discussions of the advice content and actionability, the Board determined that it was worth considering adoption. Board members were invited to review the document in order to provide necessary suggestions the following day.

Board members provided changes for the purposes of clarity, intent, and presentation. In relation to advice content, primary concerns were related clarification of the extent and geographic area for the public involvement being requested. Board members were divided regarding a format change that included a more expansive, detailed background beyond the introduction at the end of the document. The Board ultimately determined it should be included as part of the meeting minutes instead (see *Detailed Background* above).

#### *Advice Adoption*

The presence of a quorum was confirmed, and consensus was achieved on the second day of the meeting.

#### **Congratulatory Letter on Tank Integrity and Pipeline Integrity**

Bob Suyama, TWC chair, presented a draft letter of appreciation to DOE. The letter was intended to recognize efforts by representatives of the DOE Office of River Protection (ORP) and Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS)—Dusty Stewart and Karthik Subramanian—who provided the Board with thorough and informative briefings related to the Tank and Pipeline Integrity Program (TAPI). TWC wished to receive consensus approval for the letter. It was noted that this letter was initially developed as part of a larger piece of advice focused on SSTs.

The letter intent and content were well received by the Board and the letter was approved. Steve Wiegman agreed to sign the letter as HAB chair on behalf of the Board.

## Committee Reports

Pam Larsen, the HAB national liaison, provided her report consisting of news and topics from across the DOE complex, including DOE Headquarters contracting intentions and status of sites and projects. The full report is provided as *Attachment 9*.

Jeff Burright provided background on recent PIC discussions. The committee now commonly held round robin discussions to serve as ice breakers; the most recent round robin discussion focused on media relations for Hanford. It resulted in many different thoughts on how media acts as a tool in Hanford cleanup and the potential limitations of Hanford outreach. Additionally, the committee talked through its work plan, resulting in several potential topics to examine such as acting upon a recommendation from a recent Government Accountability Office (GAO) report on tank waste closure. Susan Leckband noted that each year the HAB had a column in the Tri-City Herald, which could be an avenue through which the HAB reaches the public.

Tom Galioto provided the BCC update. The BCC was working with DOE to arrange an advance presentation for DOE's upcoming budget public meeting. They were also planning on holding an open forum discussion with DOE what information on federal budgets could be shared with the HAB in general; Tom Galioto encouraged anyone interested in the subject to attend the meeting. BCC hoped to receive a self-assessment from DOE on how its indefinite quantity/indefinite delivery contracting process was working, considering there were contracts in place long enough to allow the local DOE representatives to assess the effectiveness. Starting in December, BCC would begin formulating a team to examine Fiscal Year 2024 cleanup and budget priorities.

Antone Brooks provided a short overview of discussions held by HSEP. Discussions centered around health hazards, beryllium concerns, chemicals within tank waste and potential hazards associated with processing waste, and traffic safety. He noted that HSEP and TWC hoped to engage Bruce Napier of Pacific Northwest National Laboratory for discussions related to the environmental transport of radiological contaminants, with specific focus on the B-109 tank leak.

The mention of the B-109 tank leak led into additional discussion on the topic. Rob Davis noted his concern over the presentation TWC received on the subject, feeling that the response to the tank leak felt dismissive. Gerry Pollet agreed, stating that immediate action needed to be taken in leak response.

Bob Suyama noted that conversation had shifted toward a TWC topic and noted that the committee was considering development of advice on SSTs. Chris Sutton contributed a suggestion for advice to consider long-term site conditions, where pump-and-treat operations may no longer be performed. In this instance, would the leaking tank waste still be underground and percolating to the groundwater? Antone Brooks noted that, while he did not condone leaks, the Board should consider that the hazards of today might not be at the same hazard level later; cesium has a 30-year half-life and in 100 years the risk it posed would be considerably reduced.

Laurene Contreras reiterated that from the Yakama Nation perspective, 100% cleanup was the primary goal. The Hanford Site consisted of sacred land and cultural sites that its membership wanted to protect and preserve. She felt that DOE was consistently looking for ways to cut corners in funding to not completely clean up the site. She felt that so long as the TPA agencies met benchmarks set by the established rules and regulations, they would consider cleanup to be good enough, but it would never be good enough in Yakama Nation's mind short of 100% cleanup. Plumes needed to be monitored to protect the groundwater. Water feeds everything and is a significant aspect of their culture. She did not want

anyone to be afraid of holding those discussions, because the work put in at the time would protect the future.

Bob noted that much of the TWC business had been discussed already. He noted the additional discussions that had been held in the recent TWC meeting. He noted that a recent open forum discussion of the recent GAO report went well, a format that could be a strong option for other Board discussions in the future as it did not require an agency presentation.

Tom Sicilia, Oregon Department of Energy, provided the RAP status update, including discussions held, upcoming topics, and items that they were tracking.

The HAB chair and vice chair discussed the results of recent Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board (EMSSAB) chairs meetings. They were considering the path forward on a task requested of the SSAB chairs, which involved development of a white paper related to public involvement in relation to DOE's 10-year strategic vision. They hoped that the PIC committee would be able to assist in development of the resulting white paper. The meetings notably included a presentation from the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) regarding risk communication. It was noted that the meetings were available online for anyone interested in watching.

The meeting recordings are available on YouTube: [Day 1](#) and [Day 2](#).

### **Round Robin Discussion**

Steve Wiegman introduced a round-robin discussion topic for the Board to examine: "Considering Hanford cleanup goals for the next 10 years and beyond, what is the most important thing to do to engage Hanford stakeholders in cleanup decisions and progress?"

Bob Suyama thought back to the previous discussion on HAB Advice and determined that one of the most effective avenues for agencies to engage stakeholders was to engage the HAB. The HAB was set up to engage with TPA agencies and the public, representing stakeholders from around the region. Also, the HAB consisted of membership that cared. He considered what the HAB had done over the last decade and felt concerned. It seemed to him that the HAB was being managed more while receiving less funding. He felt the HAB previously had more flexibility and more meetings. He wanted to focus on ensuring that the HAB provided results and hoped for more participation in providing those results.

Phil Lemley, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments, thought the best thing to do would be to ensure the HAB and TPA agencies were open, transparent, and honest. The TPA agencies needed the HAB's help, and the HAB needed theirs; without concerted effort by both sides, it would not happen. There were a lot of stakeholders with different interests within the HAB, each with their own agendas. The HAB just needed to be honest about its thoughts.

Rob Davis believed the HAB needed to become more proactive in handling the root causes of its concerns, which was mobile waste. The mission should be immobilizing waste, by means of either grout or glass. When they look at the erosion of meetings and budget to support the HAB, they could also see erosion of the HAB's mission. He wanted to be more proactive in holding DOE accountable for those things.

Gerry Pollet stated that the question was not about a specific issue, like emptying tanks. He felt the question should lead to how the HAB could design a community-responsive engagement, and subsequently, how it could support it. It required real commitment to community engagement. He felt that meaningful engagement and input had not been done for years. When the public felt that it was not heard from, it became discouraged. Gerry wanted to see a design for engagement for all affected communities.



He noted that there had not been a public meeting held in the City of Spokane, a city downwind from the Hanford Site, for over eight years. He felt that there needed to be ongoing effort where there were resources within the HAB, such as PIC, to design an engagement strategy over the next 10 years.

Steve Anderson, Grant and Franklin Counties, reflected on comments over the previous months. From his prospective, the biggest focus should be improving the baseline understanding of the citizenry as the most valuable input would come from an informed, knowledgeable citizenry. Success would be led by finding the best way to allow people to understand the state of the site: where it was currently and where it was going. He felt it was extremely important that there existed a group like the HAB that could stand up and speak out to enhance that knowledge level.

Jacob Reynolds was uncertain of the answer, so he decided to relay what inspired his involvement in the HAB. He considered what made the government look dysfunctional and polarized. The HAB consisted of considerably different views on the world within its membership, but successfully collaborated to get things done. He saw the opportunity for people to come and see the validity of several viewpoints being shared within a successful organization.

Emmitt Jackson thought that, as a tool to engage stakeholders, the HAB was a best-kept secret. Looking at the makeup of the Board, it contained considerable technical expertise. Few really knew about abilities of Board, so he thought the Board would benefit by getting out and making its abilities known. The HAB cannot achieve that just within its own environment, so it needed to get out and talk to the public. He wondered: Do they need to go to town hall meetings? Go to different organizations and present? He was unsure but knew the HAB needs to actively engage.

Liz Mattson stated that one of the most important things to do around the end states issue was to get to that “balcony conversation” about the future, do visioning together, and broaden who was included in that conversation. She thought a shift in TPA agency action was required to engage in public involvement. Everyone needed to collectively get to that conversation of what the future looked like and what needed to be done. Many of those questions were already laid out through work done within the Committee of the Whole. She felt there was consternation and fear about more contamination being left of site, along with potential for issues that were difficult to foresee at the time.

Shelley thought that the most important aspect was to acknowledge that institutional knowledge was essential in the cleanup journey, and in turn public involvement was essential. For the HAB, it was impossible to go to the public without a clear understanding of the cleanup and what it would take to get the funding to cleanup and sustain said funding. She relayed her previous experience in the RAP. Meetings used to have over 70 attendants sitting in on the committee meetings, consisting of SMEs, project managers, and even the Bechtel president. She felt that, at the present time, promises of transparency were only lip service from DOE; she expected that DOE representatives could be listening in on the meeting and not identifying themselves as listeners.

Shelley felt that the Board was not appreciated, and instead felt that there was an adversarial relationship with the agencies they advised, when, if anything, they should be working together to prepare for later years as other sides closed and the DOE complex lost its “national muscle.” With fewer sites, it would be they would lose a collective voice and presence. She felt the agencies did not appreciate what the HAB could bring or its ability to build concern and interest within its members’ community. They needed to work towards educating and articulating concerns to the public, while also serving as good listeners to public thought and concerns.

A big concern was how DOE Environmental Management would keep interest by Congress and the public at large as other sites close. The Hanford mission would be scaling up, while interest would diminish. She wondered how they would keep the funding for those mandates.

Susan Leckband agreed with much of what had been said by this point. In the shorter term, she wanted to see TPA agencies advised to step up in informing stakeholders and the public. They needed to provide continuous and understandable public involvement. She noted that there used to be a kiosk at DOE headquarters that provided information about cleanup at Hanford. Something like that could be recreated at the public libraries and allow for two-way communication. Whatever the method, it needed to be consistent and needed to get back to a collaborative relationship, rather than just “checking boxes” for public involvement with no real action.

Todd Martin, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington, noted that his items would align with thoughts other members already expressed. He felt that DOE needed to embark on a serious, good faith effort to “get back to basics” on stakeholder involvement, which consisted of three primary parts. The first was to provide early access to critical information that informed cleanup decisions. The second was to provide substantial opportunity for stakeholder input that goes into the Board budget. Third, agencies needed to communicate back to the Board regarding what was done with advice received. He did not expect that a highly interested, highly active, and mostly volunteer Hanford stakeholder community could survive another five to ten years with the continued erosion mentioned observed by members. Finally, Todd expressed that the Board absolutely had to get back to in-person meetings.

Antone Brooks noted that he was frequently asked what was being cleaned up at the Hanford Site, to which he responded that they were not cleaning up anything; just moving it around. He felt that the term “environmental isolation” was more appropriate for the operation at hand. He felt that, for stakeholders, the most important aspect was transparent risk communication: what the risks are and what decisions impact risk the most. He felt that some decisions made no impact, while others made a huge impact. It should be clear that decisions have risk impact, and that impact should be clearly communicated to the public. He personally understood the risks and their impact from a lifetime of studying them, but the public did not have that same benefit. As a result, communications needed to be tailored accordingly.

Jan Catrell, Washington League of Women, agreed with much of what had already been said. She felt it was of crucial importance to get the HAB membership packets approved. The HAB was a board of stakeholders, and meetings were highly technical with much information to be learned. Everyone that wanted to be successful needed to be able to communicate with the public about what goes on at Hanford. Prospective members that desire to participate could not due to the delay in membership approval. Jan worried that people would disengage in the interim.

She reiterated the importance of reimplementing in-person meetings; Board members needed to be able to meet and communicate with people that they would be working with. She felt that remote meetings were too stifling. Regarding the five- to ten-year plans, she felt they were on track; she was happy with the progress made and looked forward to DFLAW startup. She wanted to be involved in giving meaningful advice going forward and hoped for the appropriate respect given to seats on the Board and those that tried to participate with Board activities.

Jack Bell, Nez Pierce Tribe, stated that the Tribes participate in the HAB not for the purpose of expressing their opinions directly to the TPA agencies, as they have a government-to-government relationship through which they expressed their concerns directly. He felt that the HAB was a great place to express their ideas and provide information to the group as a whole. The Nez Pierce Tribe had a simple goal: the site to be cleaned up to allow unrestricted use for everyone. It has held that stance since 2004 and

had in place a guidance document to detail that stance. Their concern was similar to those expressed by HAB members; they felt that Tribes were not regarded as added value or helpful in the cleanup effort.

Laurene Contreras said the Yakama Nation echoed the Nez Pierce Tribe's feelings. She felt that the HAB as a group was critical for the health and welfare of the community in the Tri-City area. She communicated that the Yakama Nation maintained a vested interest in the Hanford Site as it was ceded territory. In 2021 the Site received \$2.6 billion, and she consistently heard that funding was being restricted further, which affected their ability to engage. She noted that she consistently heard from Brian Vance that he supports contractors, which was critical, but feels the HAB funding is overly scrutinized.

She was pleased that the HAB as a work group was diverse, allowing for different perspectives to be heard. Yakama Nation wanted what was best for the land; to allow it to heal and be returned for future use. She noted that she consistently hears concerns related to data gaps and not getting the information necessary. DOE stated that they were communicating but gave tight deadlines to the HAB while not maintaining similar timeframes for their portions of communication.

Dan Solitz wanted to see a different approach for long-term consideration. He wanted DOE to work with the HAB in telling the story of what has happened. He felt it would go along way toward building information on what was there and what has been dealt with. To understand what was in the river, it needed to be looked at in geologic time to allow understanding of what was there and its impact.

Jeff Burright liked the idea of getting back to in-person meetings. He wanted the HAB to get back into the "trust zone" with the TPA agencies and with each other. He recognized the associated challenges, as environmental cleanup was third in the nation as a liability. It was a high-stakes effort, but felt the quality of the HAB's input was dependent on the quality and depth of information received from the agencies.

He felt a tank waste task force was necessary. When looking to what would be important in the following ten years, it would be particularly important to educate regarding the tank waste mission and expectations. He felt that end states discussion was an important one to hold. He was aware that, even with isolation efforts, there would be waste present on the site for a long time. They needed to consider downstream impacts and needed to renew that conversation at least once per generation.

Tom Sicilia noted that, in the short term, the Board heard a lot about how actionable, timely advice was desired by the TPA agencies. He felt the Board needed to understand what the agency priorities were in the near term to get ahead of decisions being made. He wanted to see a visual timeline be presented on the Hanford website to put everything into context, as it was all interconnected.

Tom Galioto thought that the most important thing for continued public engagement was positive change. He felt the Board was seen as an irritant to DOE; he wanted them to show value through effective follow up to advice, questions, and other communications. He provided the example of the Vista Field redevelopment effort in Kennewick. It was a large, long-term project involving multiple organizations with the goal of repurposing a former airfield into a multi-use development resembling a small city. Though the collaboration process was frustrating at times, it was ultimately very effective in defining the vision for future land use. He hoped the HAB could provide similar collaboration in the future; he hoped to get to the point of becoming a valued partner to DOE.

Chris Sutton noted that he previously supported the Fernald Complex cleanup effort, which was one of the few DOE sites to be completely cleaned up and handed over for long-term stewardship. He recalled that public interest was very high at the start of the project, but gradually diminished as it went on. He thought there would be a similar trend in public interest at Hanford; as DFLAW operations became routine, they would see a decrease in interest and attention. The question Chris wanted to address was

how to engage the public as the attention diminished. He expected that one primary question would remain constant: what would happen to the land when cleanup was done? What would it be used for, and what were the end states?

Chris thought the HAB could continue to encourage DOE on a regular basis to hold public workshops to provide updates on end states, future use, and risk remaining, and in turn gain consistent input and interest as those were areas that would remain of interest to the public.

Larry Haler, Public at Large, saw the effective public engagement effort as a continual campaign. The chairman and other HAB representatives would need to engage local media and let them know what the HAB has done to monitor cleanup, accelerate cleanup, and benefit the public. He felt that the public attention was not focused on Hanford at that time because things were going smoothly; if that was not the case, there would be no end to the comments. His perspective, informed by his experience in public office, was that they needed to provide as much information as possible without impeding DOE's efforts. He thought that if the public knew that they were successful in their work with DOE, it would assist in securing funding in the future.

Ginger Wireman encouraged interested HAB members to reach out to David Bowen. She felt that following the departure of Ecology's nuclear waste program director, there was no one at Ecology that had expectations of public involvement. David was hired with the expectation that he would engage with the community and public. She considered ideas for getting Board participation from a younger generation, such as a scholarship at Washington State University associated with participation on the Board. Regarding long-term stewardship and end states, she was unsure if there were restrictions and though they could start considering options, such as planning with the National Park Service, Tribes, and others for those plans. She felt it was very important for Tribal voices to be heard to work toward repairing past racial harms.

Stan Branch took the opportunity to note the comments heard regarding what DOE did or did not like to see from the HAB. He clarified that DOE did not see the HAB as an irritant and that DOE both requested and valued the feedback the HAB provides. He reiterated that DOE valued the HAB's perspective and liked to provide briefings whenever possible. When DOE had the opportunity to speak to the HAB, it was an opportunity for them to talk about the good things they do and accomplish at Hanford. He noted that they receive funding on an annual basis based on the President's budget and try to request as much as they can, but it also needs to be used to further the cleanup mission.

Steve Wiegman stated that, as a member of the public, he spends a lot of time outside enjoying the region. He's seen tremendous changes over the years in cleanup and in the region. They had to challenge themselves to preserve the Columbia River and the regional landscape. In the ten-year window, the top of his mind was credibility; as citizens, they needed to understand what DOE was trying to accomplish in the five- to ten-year windows to understand and track progress being made. The TPA agencies needed to treat cleanup like a contract; not "maybe we will or won't." He had seen many projects stop because of decisions made afterward. Departments needed to make it clear what they would do and then stay the course and get it done.

Rob Davis considered Steve's statement, thinking the best route would be to obtain more directed funding from Congress. He did not like that the DOE Office of River Protection (ORP) was being done away with before the mission was complete, considering it was initially established because Congress lacked confidence in the DOE Richland Operations Office's (RL) ability to get things done. He considered the option of contacting legislators.

## **Board Business**

Ruth Nicholson reminded the board that some committees began organizing an end states/Committee of the Whole planning group. Following discussion, it was determined that the EIC could determine how to structure the related conversation on the topic going forward. A two-hour EIC call was scheduled for Tuesday, June 22 at 10:00 a.m. The facilitator requested that attending HAB members provide the agenda topics for the call in advance of that call.

Gary Younger was noted that Randy Bradbury of the Washington State Department of Ecology would be retiring on July 22. Gary extended his thanks for Randy's contributions.

## **Attachments**

Attachment 1: [Hanford Advisory Board Meeting Agenda](#)

Attachment 2: [Department of Energy Agency Update](#)

Attachment 3: [Department of Ecology Agency Update](#)

Attachment 4: [Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste Program Update](#)

Attachment 5: [Draft Hanford Advisory Board Fiscal Year 2022 Work Plan](#)

Attachment 6: [Draft Hanford Advisory Board Fiscal Year 2022 Calendar](#)

Attachment 7: [Draft Advice on Public Involvement in Vision and Guiding Documents](#)

Attachment 8: [Draft Letter on Tank and Pipeline Integrity Program](#)

Attachment 9: [HAB National Liaison Report](#)

Attachment 10: [Tank Waste Committee Report](#)

Attachment 11: [Issue Manager Team List](#)

## **Attendees**

### **Board Members and Alternates:**

Steve Anderson, Primary	Antone Brooks, Primary	Shelley Cimon, Primary
Susan Coleman, Primary	Laurene Contreras, Primary	Rob Davis, Primary
Tom Galioto, Primary	Rebecca Holland, Primary	Emmitt Jackson, Primary
Pam Larsen, Primary	Susan Leckband, Primary	Philip Lemley, Primary
Dori Luzzo Gilmour, Primary	Todd Martin, Primary	Liz Mattson, Primary
Gerry Pollet, Primary	Jacob Reynolds, Primary	Dan Solitz, Primary
Bob Suyama, Primary	Jack Bell, Alternate	Jeff Burright, Alternate
Jan Catrell, Alternate	Larry Halder, Alternate	Larry Lockrem, Alternate
Steve March, Alternate	Marissa Merker, Alternate	David Reeploeg, Alternate
Tom Sicilia, Alternate	Chris Sutton, Alternate	Amber Waldref, Alternate

**Others:**

Stan Branch, DOE	David Bowen, Ecology	Dieter Bohrmann, Central Plateau Cleanup Company (CPCCo)
Tom Fletcher, DOE	Randy Bradbury Ecology	Linda Maiden, CPCCo
JoLynn Garcia, DOE	Suzanne Dahl, Ecology	Abigail Zilar, General Services Support Contractor to DOE
Carrie Meyer, DOE	Edward Holbrook, Ecology	Stephanie Brasher, HMIS
Brian Stickney, DOE	Dan McDonald, Ecology	Patrick Conrad, HMIS
Brian Vance, DOE	Ryan Miller, Ecology	Dana Cowley, HMIS
Gary Younger, DOE	Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Scott Davis, HMIS
	David Einan, EPA	Michael Turner, HMIS
	Earl Fordham, Washington State Department of Health (DOH)	Gina Joiner, Jacobs
	Tom Rogers, DOH	Peter Bengston, WRPS
		Wayne Barber, Weapons Complex Monitor
		Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald
		Kelsey Shank, theEDGE
		Esteban Ortiz, GreenLatinos
		Mary Bent
		Theresa Bergman
		Gabriel Bohnee
		Joe Cruz
		Robinson Donovan
		Padraic Fox
		Alex Goldman
		Dee Gray
		Joan Lucas
		Kylee McGill
		Henry Muetting
		Paul E Noel

		Levi Otis
		Nikolas Peterson
		Miles Smith
		Robert Thomas
		Geoffrey Tyree
		Teresa Wright
		KB
		Li Wang, Yakama Nation Environmental Restoration/Waste Management (YN ERWM)
		Rose Ferri, YN ERWM
		Maxwell Woods, Oregon Department of Energy
		Jodi Christiansen, HAB Facilitation Team
		Scott Fillmon, HAB Facilitation Team
		Ruth Nicholson, HAB Facilitation Team
		Joshua Patnaude, HAB Facilitation Team
		Olivia Wilcox, HAB Facilitation Team

Note: Participants for this virtual meeting were asked to sign in with their name and affiliation in the chat box of Microsoft Teams. Not all attendees shared this information. The attendance list reflects what information was collected at the meeting.